the clerk did not know Kanarese and that no work could be assigned to him. In March 1933, the Registrar of Assurances brought to notice a few instances in which clerks who did not know the local vernacular were posted to the sub-offices in his district and stated that work in those offices had been dislocated. The question of the amendment of the Madras Ministerial Service Rules so as to remove such difficulties is under consideration.

Provincial Finance.

Admissibility of travelling allowance under rule 95 of the Madras Travelling Allowance Rules.

* 584 *Q.*—Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Government have issued a Government Order in June 1933 amending rule 95 of the Madras Travelling Allowance Rules;

(*b*) whether in that Government Order, travelling allowance for journey to obtain second medical opinion in support of an application for extension of leave has been permitted;

(*c*) whether, with reference to the permission referred to in clause (*b*), petitions claiming travelling allowance under the Government Order cited above, have been received by the Government from and after June 1933; and

(*d*) if so, in which of the departments travelling allowance was sanctioned and in which of the departments travelling allowance was refused in such cases?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Subject to the restrictions laid down in the rule, it was intended to cover a journey to obtain a second medical opinion in support of an application for extension of leave and the rule was amended in June 1933 to make the intention clear.

(*c*) Claims under the rule do not require the sanction of Government, but may be sanctioned by the authorities specified in the rule. Only two cases have come to the notice of Government, one in the Revenue Department and another in the Law Department.

(*d*) The claims were refused in both the cases.

Irrigation

The Pennar-Kumudavathi project.

* 585 *Q.*—Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state at what stage the Pennar-Kumudavathi project is (in Anantapur district)?

1st February 1934]

A.—On an examination of the scheme based on an estimate prepared in 1930, it was considered desirable to have the question of the availability of supply further examined by taking gaugings, for a period of five years, before coming to a conclusion on the feasibility of the scheme. For this purpose the Chief Engineer requires a special staff of one overseer and one gumasta for a period of seven months in each of five years, but it has not been possible till now, on account of financial stringency, to accord sanction to the employment of this staff.

Progress of the Tippayapalem project.

* 586 *Q.*—S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) when the Tippayapalem project (Kurnool) was taken up and how much work is completed;

(*b*) whether the project will be ready by the end of 1934; and

(*c*) whether any Special Officer has been deputed to finish the work earlier?

A.—(*a*) It was taken up in 1931 but after an expenditure of Rs. 1,400 was incurred it was stopped owing to retrenchment. It was resumed in November 1932. The masonry core wall up to level + 550·00 including concrete has been completed between longitudinal sections 177 and 325. Masonry in the right flank weir has been raised to + 558·00 in the upstream wing and to +563·00 in the other portions, except at the abutment, where the work has been stopped at +556·00. The construction of temporary quarters for clerks and improvements to section officers' quarters have been completed.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The work has been under execution by a special subdivision from the beginning.

S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur:—"With reference to the answer given to clause (*b*), may I know what difficulties the Government have in finishing this project by the end of 1934?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"It is not possible to finish it earlier."

Execution of drainage schemes recommended by the Settlement Officer, Guntur district.

* 587 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received the information called for by them referred to in question No. 296, dated 2nd November 1933, from the officer concerned;

(*b*) if so, whether they will be pleased to lay it on the table of this House;